

June 26, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 7989

Polish workers, technicians, and engineers."

As a number of us here in Congress have contended for years, when the chips are down the Polish Communists, the captors of the long-suffering Polish people, will be right in there pitching with the Soviet Communists. What better proof do we need that all the talk about winning the Polish Communists away from the Soviets is nothing but dangerous daydreaming.

It is time for the American people to demand an explanation from those unrealistic officials who have been pushing the "building bridges" baloney with the East European Communist leaders.

I include the above-mentioned item from the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 26, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

WHAT PRICE U.S. AID? POLAND ARMS HANOI
WARSAW, June 25 (AP).—Poland pledged full assistance Sunday to the Vietnamese Communists "until complete victory" and disclosed that Polish firearms already have been sent to Hanoi.

"We are glad that Polish guns are bringing concrete results to you in your fight," Polish Communist Politburo member Zenon Kliszko was quoted as saying in a Polish Press Agency account of his just-completed five-day visit to North Vietnam.

"We are giving and we will continue to give material, political and military aid," he said.

Kliszko, regarded as the top Polish Communist next to party leader Wladyslaw Gomułka, was addressing a Hanoi antiaircraft unit which has been armed with "equipment furnished by Polish workers, technicians and engineers," and has shot down or damaged 40 American planes, the agency said.

(Poland has received United States aid since 1957 under a policy intended to reduce Warsaw's dependence on the Soviet Union. Total aid through June 30, 1965, was \$979 million. Some \$425 million in food and machinery was provided between 1957 and 1960 alone. Last January, President Johnson announced he was ready to help Poland ease the burden of its debt to the U.S. involving \$500 million for surplus food deliveries.)

Kliszko returned to Warsaw on Saturday night after talks in Moscow with Soviet Communist Party chief Leonid I. Brezhnev.

The first disclosure of Polish arms in Vietnam coincided with publication of a Polish-North Vietnamese communique harshly assailing not only the American military effort but also "the deceitful maneuvers of the Johnson Administration for so-called peace negotiations without any initial conditions."

NE file

U.S. FOOD TO EGYPT, JORDAN, AND SYRIA?

(Mr. SCHADEBERG (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Florida) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was very disturbing on Friday morning to read an Associated Press report dated Rome, June 22, which hints broadly that the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization already expects us to give a large boost to the Arab Nations this fall.

Imagine. The nations of Egypt, Jordan, and Syria—who may well enough have a food shortage facing them—are already looking to the nation they have so recently condemned, cursed, and criticized in order to keep their populace fed.

I would ask the three nations where their Soviet friends are hiding now that they are needed?

On June 25 the United Press International in Moscow made note of the fact that last year's grain harvest in Russia set an alltime record, and approximated some 190 million tons. Yet only a dribble of grain was sent by the Russians to Egypt, Jordan, and Syria.

Can it be that the Soviets are only willing to supply arms in large quantity, and not life-sustaining grain? If we are to believe the dispatch telling of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the token amount of grain shipped by the Russians last year to the three Arab nations will only scratch the surface of real need, and the United States will be expected to turn the other cheek and supply some 1.5 million tons of grain to build the Arab Nations back into fighting trim.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the U.N. will also suggest that we supply large amounts of building material to rebuild our legations and Embassies so recently stoned and damaged in the nations of Jordan, Syria, and Egypt.

The American public has certainly shown a real reluctance when the Congress talks of promoting East-West trade. Is it any wonder when they read of such outlandish proposals as the one the U.N. group now makes?

And if I may also point out, Mr. Speaker, the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Mr. William B. Macomber, Jr., advised me on June 23 that his Department is continuing the restriction on travel into the three Arab nations mentioned above. The governments named in the United Nations assessment are still so hostile to us that they will not even allow travel by Americans inside their borders; yet from all indications, we will be expected to feed their hungry.

It is my fervent hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the Congress will take a cold, hard look at any proposal which would obligate our Government to supply individuals who absolutely hate us. I do not have sufficient faith in the muddled minds of our State Department officials to believe that they will be able to see anything incongruous in our possibly expanding aid to hostile governments such as those of Egypt, Jordan, and Syria.

WHO IS TO BLAME FOR INCREASE IN CRIME?

(Mr. ARENDS (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Florida) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, who is to blame for the alarming increase in crime throughout the United States? Who is to blame for the widespread rioting? Who is to blame for the looting, the vandalism, and the general lack of respect for law and order?

Not the people, Mr. Speaker. It is they who are the victims of crime and lawlessness. The majority of the American people are God-fearing, law-abiding citizens. They are not apathetic. They are

disturbed and distressed in their helplessness. They have appealed and urged that something be done.

Nor are our State and local law-enforcement agencies and officers to blame. Considering the limitations imposed on them, particularly by the courts, they have done a remarkable job under the most adverse circumstances.

Nor is the Congress to blame, Mr. Speaker. We have repeatedly sought to strengthen our laws only to meet with obstruction from the Department of Justice. We received no assistance whatever in trying to write an antirioting provision into the civil rights bill last year. The Department opposed the Pool bill which dealt with stoppage of our troop trains. The Attorney General has taken a passive attitude toward the prosecution of draft-card burners and draft dodgers. An omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia was vetoed.

It was Vice President HUMPHREY who said that he might go so far as to lead a riot himself. For several years the Johnson administration spokesmen have excused lawlessness, and to excuse is to condone and to condone is to encourage.

Mr. Speaker, it is President Johnson himself and the policy followed by his administration that is to blame for the grave moral situation confronting our country. It is he, and his Attorney General, that have been apathetic.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blaming the People," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of last Friday, June 23:

BLAMING THE PEOPLE

Now he tells us! According to our commander-in-chief in the war on crime in this country, the people have themselves to blame for the ever-rising crime wave.

"I hope," said the President, "that everyone in this country will become alarmed at what is happening and ask their representatives in Congress to do something about it." For good measure, he added that people who say they are against crime should "show it by their votes as well as by their voices."

This from a President who vetoed last year's crime bill for the District. This from a President who has ignored the recommendation by a majority of his own crime commission for legislation to authorize carefully supervised wiretaps and other modern devices in detecting crime and apprehending criminals. This from a President whose selection of men to serve on our highest court has hampered and probably will continue to hamper the police in the interrogation of criminal suspects—an essential weapon in law-enforcement. This, in summary, from a President who has advocated legislation which, over the long haul, may be helpful in combating crime, but who has proposed little or nothing to deal effectively with the crime which is engulfing the country right now and which in too many places has made law-abiding people afraid to leave their homes at night.

If the President thinks the public is apathetic or indifferent to the impact of crime, we have a suggestion to offer. He should listen to the people who are the victims of crime, which, according to the FBI, jumped 20 percent in the first three months this year over the comparable period last year. He should also stop listening to his new Attorney General who thinks there is "no wave of crime" in this country, but who wishes there was because waves rise and recede.

H 7990

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 26, 1967

THE NATION'S MOST OUTSTANDING COLLEGE GIRL

(Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Florida) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that the young lady who has been named "the Nation's most outstanding college girl," is a student from my hometown of Yakima, Wash. And I am more than pleased that this outstanding example of today's ideal young woman is a student intern in my congressional office this summer.

Miss Judy Hill, a sophomore at the University of Washington, was selected a few days ago as the National College Queen of the 1967 National College Queen Pageant in New York City. One college girl from every State competed for this high honor.

This pageant is an annual event which gives recognition to students for their scholastic ability. It is not a beauty contest. Judging is based on academic accomplishment—as well as attractiveness, charm, and personality.

Of course, when a scholarship committee in my congressional district selected Judy as a summertime intern for my office from among many students who applied, we had no way of knowing that she would be receiving national recognition, as she has. I was more than delighted to be advised of Judy's public recognition in winning her way through a demanding set of competitive events to the title of the National College Queen of 1967."

We, who serve as national legislators, are deeply aware of the challenging problems that face our Nation, and I rejoice that through programs such as the National College Queen Contest, young women from throughout the Nation receive public recognition for helping to preserve the qualities that have made our country great.

And I wish to congratulate the sponsors of the National College Queen contest, the Best Foods Division of Corn Products Co., for their fine public service. I would hope that this type of public service becomes even more prevalent among American businesses to focus public attention to the fine qualities of young Americans.

BROADCAST REGULATION

(Mr. BROTZMAN (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Florida) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time there is discussion in the Congress and in the Nation's news media about the proper role of the Federal Government in regulating the content of radio and television programs and commercials.

Two questions often are asked. First: Does the American public feel it should be the responsibility of the Federal Government to exert stronger control? And second, would stronger control by the

Federal Government be consonant with our basic freedom of the press?

Insofar as the first question is concerned, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress a recent study conducted by the National Research Center of the University of Chicago for the National Association of Broadcasters.

The study utilized a public opinion poll to provide statistics, and I would like to cite some of the results.

Sixty-four percent of the American public said they think broadcasters themselves should do the policing of radio and television programs. Twenty-eight percent thought it should be a Federal Government function, and 8 percent had no preference.

The study also sampled the feelings of persons who react favorably and those who tend to react unfavorably to programs and commercials. There was virtually no difference in the results. In fact, paradoxically, 64 percent of those who react favorably preferred self-regulation by the industry, against 63 percent for the "favorable" group.

The second question cannot be answered through public opinion polls, but must be put to the test by Congress and the regulatory bodies which we have established and will establish. It is a matter which must be put to not only legal tests, but also to the more basic criteria of commonsense and conscience, not only by the 90th Congress, but, I suspect, by all future Congresses.

There will always be those who want to legislate absolute Federal control over all activities of the American citizens, and those who argue against any and all Federal regulations. Typically, Congress must continue to decide wherein lies the public interest—for its own as well as future generations.

I believe that the broadcasting industry, backed by the NAB Radio and Television Codes, is equipped to police itself, and as long as this industry is diligent about keeping its own house in order I would oppose Federal takeover of these very sensitive functions.

(Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Florida) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KUPFERMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTES TO DR. WILLIAM G. CARR BY THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

(Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Florida) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Education Association held a banquet to honor Dr. William G. Carr. Dr. Carr served the NEA for 38 years. He has provided inspiring and dedicated leadership.

What follows is the tributes paid to Dr. Carr on the evening of May 20. They certainly are deserved.

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION BANQUET IN HONOR OF WILLIAM G. CARR

Dr. Applegate, president, National Education Association: It seems to me that never before has a presiding officer had a task such as mine, for it would take a person far more learned than I to arrange the guests tonight in their proper order of protocol. I could abdicate my responsibility and refer you to the printed list; I could save the best until the last as has been done by many faced with such a challenge, but I shall not. I shall instead exercise a woman's prerogative and ask the person who I am sure all of us acknowledge as the most-to-be-honored guest here tonight to join me. I'm sure that you know that I refer to Mrs. William G. Carr.

Mrs. Carr, I'm sure that you would agree with me that much has been said and written concerning the attributes of women and wives, some complimentary and some not. Victor Hugo said, "Men have sight; women insight," and Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "Man has his will, but woman has her way." And then there was the anonymous Frenchman—anonymous to me, at least—who said, "Cherchez la femme," which has been freely translated to mean that behind every great man stood an even greater woman with gentle persuasion and encouragement. I'm sure that Dr. Carr would be the first to say that without your help he would long since have succumbed to the rigors of Association leadership.

We have gathered tonight to celebrate the fact that Dr. William G. Carr is emerging victorious from thirty-eight years of devoted service to the National Education Association, but we must not lose sight of an even greater record—the slightly longer length of service that you have given to the great man that we honor tonight and in so doing we honor you more. On behalf of the officers and staff of the National Education Association, please accept this small memento of the high esteem in which all of us hold you—and this is a Certificate of Merit to Mrs. William G. Carr! How about that!

"The National Education Association of the United States proudly presents this Citation of Appreciation to Elizabeth Vaughan Carr

"For giving generously of her energy and talents for more than thirty-eight years in service to the Association

"For setting an inspiring example of faith and courage in periods of adversity and crisis

"For devoted support of the Association's efforts to improve the status of the teaching profession and to advance the cause of education

"For gracious hospitality and genuine friendship freely given to thousands of members of the Association and to the educational leaders of many lands.

"Awarded at the banquet and reception honoring Dr. and Mrs. William G. Carr, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 20, 1967."

Before I go on to introduce people in the audience, I would like to share some telegrams to Dr. Carr from people who could not be with us tonight:

"I have asked our mutual friend, Ralph Yarborough, to tell you how much I wish I could join all of your other friends tonight to express again my warm appreciation for your lifelong service to the cause of education. Children for generations to come, will have reason to bless the name of William Carr.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

"This is an evening which warms the hearts of all Americans of all friends of American education. In saluting your long and magnificent service, as executive secretary of the National Education Association, and in so many other good works, we salute the very best in our teaching profession. It would have been a joy to be with you on this wonderful occasion—only my previous

June 26, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8021

vanced and sophisticated an aggregate of societies as those which compose the whole of western Europe. The gap between this country and Europe, if it really exists to any significant degree, is evidently only a temporary one and, in fact, probably does not exist in certain areas of technology at all. As worst, we may not expect Europe to fall significantly and permanently behind the United States. More serious, however, is the position of large areas of the non-European world where a gap between them and the more advanced countries appears to be opening rapidly, ominously, and possibly permanently.

When one ponders the implications of these present circumstances, one is likely to feel an inward uncertainty about the large and easy solutions so frequently offered for the problems of human poverty at home or abroad. It may be that not all men under all conditions can respond as a large part of our own society responded to the massive social investment of the post World War II period. It may even be that we will have to face up to some sort of permanent subsidy, both foreign and domestic, for those who lack the skills or education to respond to larger opportunity as our own population has responded. At best, however, such a solution is only a palliative, for it does not erase the unhappiness and resentment which must arise among those who will still see a marked difference between their own position in the social order and the position of those whose expertise of one kind or another enables them to enjoy greater amenities without being subsidized. The great problem—and perhaps the great mystery—of our time is clearly delineated in this dilemma. No amount of expropriation, redistribution of wealth, or subsidization will resolve it alone. Men must find a way to strike the sparks of inner motivation. If the task seems impossible, we may still find some measure of hope in the great postwar educational experiment of this society.

NE file

AN APPEAL OF CONSCIENCE TO MR. KOSYGIN

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. VANIK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the defeat of the Arabs, and in effect, of the Soviet dream of dominating the Middle East, Russia has repeatedly accused Israel of "aggression" and Hitlerite atrocities and war crimes.

It is unthinkable that Russia, which has dominated Eastern Europe and which knowingly practices anti-Semitism, should accuse another people of being inhumane, especially one which has known the destruction of one-third of its number by these "Hitlerite atrocities."

I commend to the attention of our colleagues "An appeal of Conscience to Mr. Kosygin," by the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations. The conference asks the representative of the Soviet Union to concentrate on attaining a lasting peace in the Middle East, instead of making false accusations.

The appeal follows:

AN APPEAL OF CONSCIENCE TO MR. KOSYGIN

In statement after statement since the collapse of Russia's Arab allies in the Middle East, the Soviet Union has made repeated charges in the United Nations that Israel has committed "Hitlerite atrocities and war crimes."

The Soviet representatives and their supporters have indulged in vilification and

abuse to represent as Nazi aggression Israel's successful defense against an enemy which has sworn to destroy her in a "Holy War."

The Soviet Government has sent insulting and threatening notes to the Government of Israel, a fellow member of the United Nations, which it insists on describing as "the Tel Aviv authorities." The Soviet Government newspaper *Izvestia* has made the lying charge that Israeli troops have shot down women and children in public executions.

This vicious and unscrupulous propaganda is a potentially explosive form of warfare. Under Soviet incitement the Arabs initiated and lost the hot war for Soviet influence in the Middle East. Now the USSR has taken upon itself the full responsibility for verbal aggression. This is supported by renewed arms shipments to the Arabs.

This powerful country, the USSR, has never published a word of criticism about the Nazi war criminals who are actively mobilized in Cairo and Damascus in the war against the Jews. The Soviet Government has given unstinting support to the Arab States which disseminate the crude anti-Semitism of the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion."

The very country which is preventing the development of Jewish life within its own borders, does not hesitate to fasten the hideous label of Nazism on the survivors of a small Jewish nation which lost a third of its members in Nazi atrocities.

The accent of present Soviet propaganda is the accent of the Stalinist doctors' plot and the destruction of Soviet Jewish society. It is the accent of Soviet anti-Semitic propaganda against Judaism, of the fever of Jew-hatred that periodically seizes the Soviet press. It means that the incorrigible anti-Semites who infest Russian society are again being given their hour.

It is not the first time in this century that a major power has accused Jews of subhuman crimes and threatened dire punishment for imaginary evils. The world knows the terrible price the Jewish people have paid for such monstrous accusations. The Soviet Union should think again before it follows the appalling example of the power whose pathological hatred of Jews was the beginning of a process that brought death and destruction to many nations.

The undersigned, representing the Jewish community of the United States call upon the Soviet Union to put aside the delusion of quick and facile propaganda victories. Let it strive for a lasting peace in the Middle East, recognizing that Israel, like the Arab States, has every right to exist and prosper. The Soviet Union should consider carefully whether it indeed wishes to follow in the footsteps of those whose hatred of Jews led to the cataclysm of twenty-five years ago.

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations:

American Israel Public Affairs Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
American Zionist Council.
American Trade Union Council for Histradrut.
B'nai B'rith.
Central Conference of American Rabbis.
Hadassah.
Jewish Agency for Israel—American Section.
Jewish Labor Committee.
Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.
Labor Zionist Movement.
Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Young Israel.
Rabbinical Assembly.
The Rabbinical Council of America.
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
United Synagogue of America.
Zionist Organization of America.

CONGRESSMAN LESTER WOLFF'S REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL AIR SHOW

(Mr. KARTH (at the request of Mr. VANIK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, as a charter member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have attempted over the years to keep myself and the Congress informed on what the United States and other countries are doing in research and the technological development in the broad field of aerospace research.

As part of that effort, I have tried to attend meetings and functions where there was a possibility that I might enhance this knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, this year I was unable to attend the International Air Show recently held in Paris. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, I did encourage our colleague, LESTER WOLFF, of New York, to attend if possible and make a report to me on what he saw and what he found. So often I have found this information to be of great value during subcommittee hearings.

Since the value of these kinds of meetings is sometimes questioned by the news media, I feel it important that a summary of these findings be printed in the RECORD for everyone to see.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for having done an excellent job and submit for the RECORD a synopsis of that report, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1967.

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, Committee on Science and Astronautics.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know I recently had the privilege of attending the International Air Show as a representative of the Committee on Science as Astronautics, Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications.

It is with pride that I can report on the trip. The United States exhibitions were excellent. The Congressional delegation had valuable and potentially profitable discussions with foreign officials and business executives.

Permit me to turn first to the American space and aviation exhibits. These displays, which showed a marked improvement over our displays during the 1965 International Air Show, were certainly the best of this year's show. The exhibits by the United States Government and private industry were far more impressive than the exhibits of all the other competitors including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

While Russia and other nations, were content to display hardware without giving it meaning or purpose, the United States exhibits displayed much more. Yes, certainly our finest hardware was there. But with it were competent guides with complete display explanations for the interested visitors. The hardware was brought to life; the nuts and bolts became the work of men to achieve ago-old dreams of men.

An example of our excellence in this regard was the heavy and positive emphasis on our unmanned technical programs in space. These very important and difficult feats,

which do not capture the headlines in the manner of manned flights, were brought into proper perspective. The high level of achievement we have had in our unmanned flights and the invaluable data gathered were clearly and interestingly portrayed.

In addition to our displays the United States provided the outstanding flying exhibitions of the show. The TFX flight was acknowledged by people from every country as a high point of the week. Our aerobatic teams also excelled with their demonstration of expertly executed disciplined flying.

Another significant contribution by the United States to the Air Show was the first commercial trans-Atlantic flight of the Douglas DC-8-61, the enlarged passenger jet. The Congressional delegation was privileged to fly to Le Bourget on the inaugural flight of this aircraft which created a sensation at the Air Show. Every day we were there thousands queued up to view this new luxury aircraft. Compared to the mock-ups of the Concorde and the Russian commercial jet aircraft, the Douglas plane was the star of the show. The quality of this plane, combined with the fact that it is in actual service, give us reason to believe the United States can maintain the lead in the international race for major aircraft business. I am optimistic that this will prove highly beneficial, as it has in the past, in overcoming our balance of payments deficit.

The Congressional delegation, Mr. Chairman, besides viewing all the exhibits and representing our country at various official functions also met with foreign representatives of our government and the private sector. We discussed with these Americans, who spend most of their time abroad, their problems in dealing with foreign governments. These meetings will provide us with valuable information in assisting in the work of these technical ambassadors-of-good-will.

All of the points I have discussed thus far, Mr. Chairman, are quite important and required our presence at the Air Show. But we were fortunate enough to add a very significant bit of diplomatic activity to our trip.

I had, early in our stay, the opportunity to arrange a meeting between some members of the French Chamber of Deputies and our delegation headed by Chairman Miller. After our first meeting we were invited to and visited the Chamber of Deputies where we had the invaluable opportunity to view the Chamber in session and meet many Deputies. We were able to exchange opinions with these Deputies.

One goal of our discussions, Mr. Chairman, was to find out if there is a basis for a rapprochement between France and the United States. Although our discussions were in the area of space science and aviation the excellent relationship our delegation established with the Deputies proved that there is a basis for sound partnership between France and the United States if we can circumvent De Gaulle and correct some misconceptions on the Deputies' part.

We discussed with the Deputies the problems of overflight and sonic boom involved in their Concorde and our Supersonic Transport. They had little background in these important areas and we had the opportunity to share our knowledge and experiences with them.

If I appear optimistic about the long-term effect of our visit, Mr. Chairman, I have reason to. There will be a meeting in September between a group of Deputies, led by a leading Gaullist, Charles de Chambrun, and several representatives of our space committee. The purpose of the meeting will be to hold preliminary discussions on questions of mutual interest to both countries. This is just an example of many important areas in which the United States and France can cooperate.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional delegation to the International Air Show returned

proud and optimistic. Our country is the world leader in aviation and in space. Our future is bright. And that future may enjoy the additional benefit of increased cooperation between the United States and an old friend, France, on matters of mutual interest.

Respectfully,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

BANK CRIMES

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. VANIK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1967, I called the attention of the House to an article which appeared in the American Banker by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover on the subject of crimes against banking institutions.

These crimes have been a subject of continuing concern to the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Committee on Government Operations, of which subcommittee I am chairman. In my statement on May 25 I mentioned the hearings we held in 1963 on the problem of bank crimes and reported some of the findings and recommendations we made at that time.

Two events in the Washington area this week have dramatically underscored the continuing validity of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the subcommittees. These two events have impressed me once again with the urgency of our need for improved security in our banking institutions.

On Monday, June 19, 1967, a man walked into the Wildwood Center branch of the Bank of Bethesda carrying a paper bag. He threatened that the bag contained dynamite and that he would blow up the building if the employees did not give him access to the vault. He walked out of the bank carrying \$78,700 and he remains at large.

The Washington Post for Wednesday, June 21, 1967, carried an article on the closure of the Oxon Hill branch of the Southern Maryland Bank & Trust Co. Bank officials state that the closing of this branch is due to conditions beyond their control. The "conditions" were identified as five armed holdups in the 18 months since December 1965.

These two examples are merely isolated cases originating in the same general area but, according to articles in the June 1967 issues of Protective Bulletin—issued by the Insurance and Protective Committee of the American Bankers Association—and Banking: Journal of the American Bankers Association, the numbers of burglaries, robberies, and larcenies affecting banking institutions have been rising steadily throughout the nation during the last few years.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's answers to questions incorporated in the article in the June 1967 issue of Banking indicate his belief that the increase in bank crimes is partially due to increased numbers of branch banks in suburban areas.

Mr. Hoover said:

Such banks, by the nature of their locality and design, are easier to rob and burglarize. The buildings generally have fewer security

features; they are easier to "case" and scout prior to the job; police protection is less concentrated; and escape routes are more accessible and better concealed.

The Protective Bulletin of June 1967 states:

There are certain external and internal conditions about a bank which can either favor or discourage an after dark attack.

In addition, the bulletin says:

The initial line of defense against burglars is the bank building itself.

Especially important is the design of doors, windows, ventilation ducts, and other openings into the building which could be utilized for entrance.

The report of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee which was approved and published on February 20, 1964, included the following findings and conclusions:

Modern bank design and the increase in outlying branches have contributed to the increase in bank holdups.

There is a direct relationship between the lack of security and the incidence of external crimes.

There is ample information available on the means of preventing both internal and external crimes. There are numerous aids and devices available for use in the prevention of crimes and for the apprehension of criminals. However, many bankers resist the use of these means and devices.

Practically all losses by banking institutions resulting from crimes are covered by insurance. While insurance protects the institutions, its existence has had a tendency in some cases to make bank management lax as regards security against banking crimes.

The incidence of these crimes continues to increase despite repeated warnings and persuasion from Congress, the trade journals, responsible bankers, Federal and State regulatory agencies, and banking associations; in spite of bank examiners' interest and emphasis on security measures; in spite of full cooperation by the FBI and local law enforcement agencies; and in spite of increasing reluctance of insurance companies to underwrite low security banks.

I find it very discouraging that banking institutions, the backbone of the business community and the pillar of dependability, have not taken sufficient precautions to reduce these crimes significantly. The burden of responsibility for the continued vulnerability of banks and jeopardy to customers' accounts and valuables lies squarely and undisputably on bank management. Over the years bank management, with the concurrence of the regulatory agencies and banking associations, has taken the position that it is management's responsibility to determine what security measures are to be utilized in each individual bank.

In 1964 the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee made a number of recommendations designed to prevent these crimes. We believe that if our recommendations had been completely accepted and fully implemented by positive action on the part of the regulatory agencies and the individual bankers there would have been no increase in the number of bank crimes. There could have been a decrease. Furthermore, we believe that the recommendations contained in our report are still applicable

June 26, 1967

Participants in the course are furnished copies of a teacher's syllabus entitled, "Democracy Confronts Communism in World Affairs." This 297-page syllabus of 34 chapters was prepared under the auspices of the ABA Committee.

Also attending the meeting were the following members of the ABA's co-sponsoring committee: Morris I. Leibman, chairman, a member of President Johnson's Advisory Panel on International Problems; Charles Maddock, chairman-elect, the General Counsel of Hercules, Inc.; and Louis B. Nichols of New York City, executive vice president of Schenley Industries, Inc.

Representing the Archdiocese School System at the meeting were Rt. Rev. Monsignor Raymond P. Rigney, superintendent of schools; Rt. Rev. Monsignor Edward M. Connors, associate superintendent of schools; Rt. Rev. Monsignor Joseph T. O'Keefe, director of communications center; and Brother Augustine, director of secondary curriculum.

The lecture series will include the following:

1. Modern Democracy: Principles, Paradox and Potential.
2. Twentieth Century Totalitarianism: Common Characteristics.
3. God, Man and Society: The Premises of Communism.
4. Humanism, Individualism and the Moral Premises of Western Civilization.
5. Origins of the Cold War.
6. Permanent Factors in Soviet Foreign and Defense Policy.
7. Controversial Issues in the Court of World Opinion: Peace, Poverty, Race and Class (Myth vs. Reality).
8. Rich Nations and Poor Nations.
9. Propaganda: Magnitude, Methods and Major Themes.
10. Schisms in the Empire of Marx: Tito, Mao, The new Soviet Intellectuals, the European Satellites.
11. Soviet and Chinese Youth today.
12. Modern Capitalism and the Economic Dogma of Marx—a panel discussion.
13. The law, The Citizen and The State: Contrasts between U. S. A. and U. S. S. R.
14. The Russian Proletariat in contrast to American Labor, Alms, Methods and Achievements.
15. Religion under the Commissars.

ADA RESOLUTION MARKS SOVIET AND ARABS AS AGGRESSORS

(Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. VANIK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, questions have been raised regarding the view of liberals in the United States toward the Middle East crisis. These questions arose, to some extent, as a result of the newspaper report that Prof. Arthur Schlesinger refused to sign a strong statement denouncing the Arab-Soviet action in the Middle East and the view attributed to him that this situation was paralleled to the conflict in Vietnam. I was particularly pleased, therefore, to receive a copy of the resolution adopted by the National Executive Committee of Americans for Democratic Action on this subject. This is the organization with which Professor Schlesinger is most prominently identified. The resolution clearly marks the Soviets and the Arabs as the aggressor, voicing support for Israel's right to have taken the action she did.

I insert this resolution at this point in the RECORD:

I—REASON FOR CONCERN

ADA is greatly concerned with the problems of instability and human suffering that are now so painfully evident in the Middle East. It is concerned that Israel's future security should not become a pawn of Great Power confrontations in the area; that the instrumental functions of the United Nations should be fully utilized; and that the resolution of conflicts in the Middle East should be reached through intensive negotiation by all States in the area.

II—ADA'S PERSPECTIVE

It is imperative that a durable and equitable settlement be pursued in the Middle East. In seeking for it ADA identifies itself with the following axioms of policy:

(a) The territorial integrity of every nation within the U.N. must be firmly and legally respected. So, too, must the principle of free and innocent passage in international waterways.

(b) Under Article 51 of the U.N. Charter, Israel was fully entitled to take measures necessary for its self-defense. Naturally sympathetic to the Israelis' defense of their democratic system against the belligerent threats of their neighbors, ADA is convinced that a lasting and equitable settlement of the present conflict cannot be achieved until the sovereignty of Israel and of its frontiers is respected in law and in fact.

(c) ADA condemns the callous attacks upon Israel indulged in or prompted by Soviet officials. The viciousness of these assaults reflect a contempt for the procedures of debate in the U.N. and a genocidal attitude towards Israel's destruction.

(d) A humane solution to the desperate problem of displaced Arab communities will be found only if all countries in the area should agree to a permanent armistice, to a just revision of frontiers, and to a rapid plan for economic resettlement and expansion.

(e) The intervention of the Great Powers in this settlement should be actively discouraged. A settlement dictated by cold war interests and massive military assistance can only be ephemeral. Agreement must come, therefore, between the indigenous States. Only they can determine whether tensions are to be relaxed, arms races are to be dampened, and disinterested economic growth is to be fostered. It is the responsibility of the Great Powers to ensure that all deliberate speed be used to bring the States of the Middle East together and to promote negotiations for a just settlement.

(f) It is unrealistic to demand that the U.N. should impose peace upon the region or force an agreement between the Great and small powers embroiled in the conflict. The U.N. can serve as a vital instrument in bringing States together and in policing agreements which eventually emerge. Every effort must be made to relieve the U.N. of intractable disputes to that its functions of truce supervision, peace keeping, and collective economic expansion can be promoted.

III—ADA CALLS FOR ACTION

Bearing these axioms in mind, ADA calls upon the U.S. Government to pursue those courses of action that will most rapidly involve the States in the region in a permanent and just disposition of their conflicts. Utilizing all deliberate speed to bring these States together, the U.S. should reaffirm that it is motivated by the following concerns:

(a) The sovereignty of all nations and of their mutually agreed frontiers must be fully respected. A "state of belligerency" cannot persist between one U.N. member and another, and it is inconsistent with the spirit of the U.N. Charter to force any member—such as Israel—to accept frontiers that are neither just nor secure.

(b) International waterways, such as the Straits of Tiran and the Suez Canal, must

remain open to the free and innocent passage of ships of all nations.

(c) The revision of boundaries, the resettlement of population, and the protection of ethnic minority rights must be first determined in a cooperative manner by indigenous States and then implemented under the supervision of U.N. agencies.

(d) The military non-intervention in Middle East affairs by outside States should be guaranteed by U.N. inspection procedures.

(e) Massive economic and agricultural assistance must be provided in the immediate future. Once an armistice and a non-intervention agreement have been signed, it is vital that life-sustaining assistance should be channelled through multilateral institutions.

(f) Region-wide institutions (along the lines of the Asian Bank) must be encouraged to bridge the gap between the rich and the pauperized Arab nations and to plan the economic development of the area in a truly collective manner.

(g) The truce supervision, peace keeping, humanitarian, and economic development functions of the U. N. must be firmly consolidated and adequately financed. The U.S. must make a generous and unconditional offer to help finance any reasonable scheme for international development.

(h) Until such time as these agreements have been obtained and implemented, ADA calls upon the U. S. Government to act in a manner that will avoid as far as possible the following pitfalls. It must not

—exacerbate Great Power tensions and rivalry;

—undermine Israel's survival capabilities;—delay immediate sustenance for the Arab people;

—provoke Arab antagonisms and revenge seeking;

—deadlock or by-pass the authority of the U. N.;

—seek temporary compromises at the cost of obtaining long-range agreements.

ADA expresses confidence that the President will continue to handle Middle East affairs with the restraint and sense of justice that has so far been demonstrated.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY LOAN PROGRAM

(Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. VANIK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have been closely concerned with the Small Business Administration's economic opportunity loan program.

This program was authorized under an amendment to title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, and its purpose is to wage war on poverty by encouraging and assisting disadvantaged persons to start their own small businesses, or to enlarge and improve those they now own.

I believe that this can become a truly effective way of fighting poverty because it is in essence the fulfillment of the American free enterprise system.

Americans have always cherished the belief that any man, or woman, who has an idea, a special talent, and ambition, should have the opportunity to strike out for himself.

Indeed, this is the door of opportunity that has enabled millions of Americans to become prosperous and independent, a nation of imaginative and hard-work-

June 26, 1967

state a veritable water wonderland. For this we are grateful.

We thank you Alabama Power Company people for your power, for your people, for good citizens, for conservation practices, for recreation, for our industrial development. In fact, we thank you today for a thousand things you have done for the advancement of Alabama, one of the finest of which we dedicate here today.

Thank you very much.

RESPECT FOR THE AMERICAN FLAG

(Mr. NICHOLS (at the request of Mr. VANIK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the American flag is one of the few visible symbols of national authority. It is a symbol that demands respect and loyalty, yet today this respect and this loyalty is not present in the hearts of some of our people. Desecration of the American flag is an act that borders treason, and I am pleased that this Congress has realized this.

I am aware that Congress cannot legislate respect; for such respect must be learned in the home. However, actions such as those in Central Park cannot be tolerated just as murder is not tolerated.

It is tragic that H.R. 10480 was ever needed, but the lack of patriotism by some few Americans made this bill mandatory. It is time that we consider what caused this loss of patriotism in America, and I think the first place we should look is to some of the recent Federal Court decisions.

THE DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

(Mr. HATHAWAY (at the request of Mr. VANIK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on the floor of the House during the past 2 years about the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in my district. More recently remarks have appeared concerning an Appropriations Committee staff study of this project. It is with great pleasure that I bring to your attention today an editorial from the Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I. This article shares my belief that the committee staff study report is favorable to the project, and that the construction of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project should proceed without further delay.

The editorial follows:

A SENSIBLE PROJECT

Congress is in a sound position to proceed with the Dickey-Lincoln public power project in Maine now that the thicket of contradictory statements about its economic value has been cut away.

The controversial hydroelectric project conceived to relieve New Englanders from the highest power rates in the country was authorized in 1965, but getting planning appropriations through Congress has been like pulling teeth.

The reason was that Congress did not know whom to believe. Federal agencies like the Federal Power Commission and the Army Corps of Engineers have said right along

that the project is economically feasible, whereas the Electric Coordinating Council of New England has reported that private utilities could produce base power for the Maine area with a nuclear plant cheaper than the federal government could with Dickey-Lincoln.

Under instructions from Congress, the staff of the House appropriations committee has completed a review of studies by public and private agencies concerning the potential of Dickey-Lincoln. In the process, it has discarded many statistics submitted by the council which represents private power groups opposing the project.

The staff reports that federally financed nuclear or fossil-fuel plants in Boston and Maine would produce cheaper power than Dickey-Lincoln, but that privately financed sources of power—subject as they are to higher debt costs and taxes—would not. On the other hand, says the staff, the Dickey project would afford flood protection and create new recreation centers which would not be the case with either federally or privately financed nuclear or conventional plants.

The staff clears up another disputed point in finding that the project would have a favorable benefit-cost ratio; that is, the dollar value of its benefits would exceed the dollar cost of operating it. The council had reached the opposite conclusion—that cost would exceed the value of benefits—but the staff contends the council erred in that conclusion by figuring the life of the project at 50 years instead of 100 years.

Clearing up the point is vital because Congress puts much weight on benefit-cost ratio in helping it decide which public projects to undertake. In the last four years, it has approved seven hydroelectric projects with lower benefit-cost ratios than the one figured by the staff for Dickey-Lincoln.

The staff report does not presume to advise Congress what should be done, but by removing contradictions that have obscured Dickey-Lincoln's worth, it establishes a basis for the thesis that getting on with the project makes good sense. Congress should take the hint.

CARDINAL SPELLMAN SPEAKS OUT AGAINST COMMUNISM

(Mr. ANNUNZIO (at the request of Mr. VANIK) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a news release issued by the archdiocese of New York on June 19, 1967, stating that the archdiocese will join the American Bar Association this summer in a program aimed at disseminating greater knowledge about the differences between democracy and communism.

I commend the distinguished and great American, Francis Cardinal Spellman, for the forthright position he has taken on this particular problem and for his outstanding contributions to the unrelenting war against communism being waged by all freedom-loving Americans.

Recently, Cardinal Spellman declared that when students read Lenin, Mao Tse-tung, and others, "they can see for themselves that class war, deception, subversion and the strategy of terror are not outworn myths but the preferred instruments of the Communist Party."

It is important, therefore, that we acquaint ourselves with the facts of totalitarian life, in order that we may become better equipped to protect any encroach-

ment on our precious liberties and on the well-being of our great democratic Nation.

The news release follows:

Francis Cardinal Spellman announced today (June 19) that the Archdiocese of New York will join with the American Bar Association this summer to equip social studies teachers throughout the archdiocesan school system with greater knowledge of the differences between Democracy and Communism.

A program developed by the ABA's Standing Committee on Education About Communism and its Contrast With Liberty Under Law will be telecast via the Archdiocesan Instructional Television Network to some 200 teachers in 90 Catholic high schools over a 15-week period.

The ABA Committee instituted the program five years ago when it discovered that U.S. school teachers as a whole were "woefully lacking" in the background needed to acquaint students with the facts of totalitarian life, according to ABA president, Orison Marden, who also attended the meeting at Cardinal Spellman's residence.

Mr. Marden, a senior partner in the New York firm of White and Case, said the Committee since 1962 has furnished lecturers and study materials for summer institutes on "Democracy versus Communism" for nearly 10,000 high school teachers in 45 states, who in turn have reached an estimated 3,000,000 students.

These institutes, normally offering academic credit, have been held, he said, at such centers of learning as the universities of Colorado, Miami, Southern California and Vanderbilt, demonstrating "to the satisfaction of most educators that teaching about Communism is no longer controversial."

Cardinal Spellman said that three interacting historical trends make it timely to add this type of program to the social studies curriculum of the Archdiocese: the ecumenical movement with its emphasis on perspective; the growing responsibility of the U.S. to preserve stability in world affairs; and the increasing importance of electronic communications media as aids to education.

The Archdiocese of New York is composed of ten counties: Manhattan, Richmond, Bronx, Westchester, Rockland, Orange, Putnam, Sullivan, Dutchess and Ulster.

"While America cherishes the right to dissent," Cardinal Spellman said, "debate is always improved if the participants have done their homework. When students read Lenin, Mao Tse-Tung, Stalin and Lin Biao, they can see for themselves that class war, deception, subversion and the strategy of terror are not outworn myths but the preferred instruments of the Communist Party."

"In our revolutionary world it is vital that understanding of social justice, individual responsibilities and threats to world order keep pace with rapid scientific discovery. Young Americans are idealists, looking for meaning in their own lives and for good causes to serve. The freedom and well-being of people all over the world for years to come may depend in no small measure on the wisdom and competence of ascending generations in this nation."

The ABA program, it was explained, features academic experts, journalists and consultants to government on such subjects as: (1) The Principles and Potential of Modern Democracy; (2) Permanent Factors in Soviet Foreign and Defense Policy; (3) Soviet and Chinese Youth Today; (4) Communist Propaganda Techniques; (5) Schisms in the Empire of Marx; and (6) Modern Capitalism and the Economic Dogma of Marx.

Each lecturer or panelist is cross-examined by a team of outstanding teachers who relate problems in the classroom to the expertise of the scholar.

A 3238

"I am convinced now that this interpretation, which we hammered out with anything but historical truth as our objective, nonetheless contains an essential measure of historical truth.

"History is art as well as fact; everyone in this room knows that the facts do not automatically arrange themselves without the historian's creative leap, which occurs in our craft as well as in the exact sciences. . . .

"In May came the now-historic decision in *Brown v. Board*, in which Mr. Justice Warren, speaking for a unanimous Court, threw out Plessy and announced that henceforth State statutes supporting school segregation were declared to be unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment. . . ."

DISAGREEMENT ON INTENT

"Warren's opinion noted briefly," Mr. Kelly continued, "that there was a general disagreement among opposing counsel and historians about what the Amendment as of 1866 had been intended to mean, and thereupon proceeded to junk the historical approach entirely and instead to settle the question of segregation on straight-out sociological grounds: Racial segregation in the schools, in the context of the twentieth century, bred social inferiority for the Negro and must, therefore, be outlawed. . . .

"This does not mean the historical argument was without meaning in the Court's opinion. It seems probable, at least, that had historical inquiry resulted in a general inability on the part of the NAACP to make a plausible case—shown, in short, that the Fourteenth Amendment clearly and obviously had not been intended to touch segregation—the Court's embarrassment would have been great enough to cause it to put over the critical decision to discard segregation under the Amendment, at least for a time.

"But the historians had produced at least the 'draw' that Marshall and his colleagues had asked for. It was all they needed in order to win.

"So we historians can assure ourselves, I think, that we had something to do with the victory. Thurgood Marshall, at all odds, presently wrote some of us letters of thanks, assuring us that enlisting the history profession on his side had been the NAACP's smartest move in the whole complicated case."

United Nations: A Slight Gleam of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the talks just ended between President Johnson and Soviet Premier Kosygin apparently produced little by way of substantive agreement between them, but they demonstrated that there are links between the problems in Vietnam, the turmoil in the Middle East, and the continuing issue of arms control.

In a column in the New York Times of Sunday, June 25, Mr. James Reston stated that—

Secretary of State Rusk has been saying lately that there was "no organic link" between the problems in Vietnam and the problems in the Middle East and the problems of arms shipments and control.

But organic or no, the problems are obviously linked politically and psychologically. Each is poisoning the entire body of world politics.

Because of the scope and complexity of these problems, Mr. Reston explained:

The question now is not whether Johnson and Kosygin have been able to deal with the details of these questions—obviously they have not—but whether they can get at the heart of the problem, which is the dominion and fear on both sides, and whether they can keep the dialogue going at the highest levels of decision.

Mr. Reston states that as a result of the Glassboro meetings, "there is a chance—probably no more than that—to continue and expand the talks."

Because of the potential for peace in even the chance for continued and expanded talks, I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Reston's column with care.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, June 25, 1967]

UNITED NATIONS: A SLIGHT GLEAM OF HOPE
(By James Reston)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., June 24.—The importance of the Johnson-Kosygin talks is that they have linked the major problems of Vietnam, the Middle East and arms control, and changed both the level and the scope of the East-West discussions.

As long as each of these questions was discussed separately, and as long as they remained in the propaganda pit of the United Nations, the outlook was bleak. Both sides were locked into hopelessly contradictory positions on Vietnam and the Arab-Israeli war; both had taken commitments to their embattled clients; and the public recriminations over television merely envenomed the debate.

SAFETY IN NUMBERS?

Now, however, there is a chance—probably no more than that—to continue and expand the talks. Usually, it is better to deal diplomatically with one practical problem at a time, but occasionally it is easier to reach agreement on very large objectives, and this may be such a time.

For example, the two sides have reached an impasse on the single issue of stopping the bombing of North Vietnam and going to negotiations to end that war. The political lines have been drawn tight on this narrow but important issue within the United States. But if President Johnson and Chairman Kosygin were to formalize the search for a general settlement of world issues, it would be much easier to end the bombing during such an inquiry.

Already, the preliminary conversations between the two leaders have influenced at least one policy decision in Washington on the war in Vietnam. Secretary of Defense McNamara was just about to start for Saigon when Chairman Kosygin arrived in this country. His purpose was fairly clear. President Johnson had committed himself to give General Westmoreland whatever troops he requested. The general is understood to have requested another 100,000 men and Mr. McNamara was going to Vietnam to make a recommendation to the President on this issue.

When Premier Kosygin arrived here at the United Nations, the McNamara trip was postponed. The Secretary found himself, much to his surprise, not in Saigon but at the summit talks at Glassboro State College in New Jersey. Obviously it would be awkward to send another 100,000 American troops to Vietnam if serious conversations for a wider East-West accommodation were in process.

MOSCOW'S PROBLEMS

The Soviet Government is in a comparable position in the Middle East. While Mr. Kosygin was talking to President Johnson, President Podgorny of the U.S.S.R. was in Cairo talking to President Nasser of the United Arab Republic about replacing the

two or three billions of dollars worth of arms lost in the Israeli war.

In an atmosphere of mounting tension, with Moscow and Washington divided and Peking trying to replace Soviet influence in the Middle East, the military escalation was likely to continue in both places. It still may go forward anyway, but the Johnson-Kosygin talks have at least given both sides a little time to discuss whether it is in anybody's interest to continue along this same costly military journey.

Similarly, Moscow and Washington are on the verge of a spectacular new phase of the arms race. The President and particularly Secretary McNamara have been extremely reluctant to get into the development of an anti-ballistic missile system, which would cost about \$60 billion in the next seven years, but the more the tension mounts and spreads from Vietnam to the Middle East, the more likely it is that this upward spiral of rearmament will continue.

The question now is not whether Johnson and Kosygin have been able to deal with the details of these questions—obviously they have not—but whether they can get at the heart of the problem, which is the dominion of fear on both sides, and whether they can keep the dialogue going at the highest levels of decision.

These talks cannot safely be left to Johnson and Kosygin and their foreign secretaries. Europe, the Middle East, Southeast Asia and China have all been apprehensive that the two most powerful nations, the United States and the U.S.S.R., would make a deal to follow parallel policies that might not be in the interest of other nations in other parts of the world.

Accordingly, the need to enlarge the scope of the talks to include President de Gaulle of France and Prime Minister Wilson of Britain is fairly obvious. De Gaulle proposed such a Big Four meeting at the height of the Middle Eastern crisis, but it was turned down by Moscow, and it is still not clear that Kosygin is ready yet for such ambitious negotiations.

THE CONNECTION

Secretary of State Rusk has been saying lately that there was "no organic link" between the problems in Vietnam and the problems in the Middle East and the problems of arms shipments and control.

But organic or no, the problems are obviously linked politically and psychologically. Each is poisoning the entire body of world politics. Each problem is frozen by itself, but for a general accommodation and easing of world tensions, concessions might be made that are impossible in the narrow context of Vietnam itself.

No doubt this is reaching well beyond the present phase of the Johnson-Kosygin talks. If left where they are, the summit meeting at Glassboro State College could go down in history as little more than an amusing insult to Princeton, but if continued and expanded, they could provide more freedom of diplomatic maneuver than exists today.

Commencement Address by the Honorable
 Gladys M. Dorman, at the Second
 Commencement Exercises, Kings-
 borough Community College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1967, I had the pleasure of attending

phasing out of restricted Federal grants; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Senate of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to provide, without restrictions, a system for the sharing of Federal income taxes with the several States out of funds provided both by cutbacks and elimination of existing and projected expansions of Federal grant-in-aid programs, and from the increased revenue provided by our burgeoning national economy, so as to facilitate the capacity of our State and local governments to provide a more meaningful response to the needs of the people; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to every member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois, and the Governor and the presiding officers of the Legislatures of each of the other forty-nine states.

Adopted by the Senate, May 3, 1967.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.

EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the House of Representatives, June 15, 1967.

Speaker of House of Representatives.

FREDERIC B. SELCKE,

Clerk of House of Representatives.

FCC "Fairness" Rule on Cigarettes Seems Ominous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

FCC "FAIRNESS" RULE ON CIGARETTES SEEMS OMINOUS

There's no particular panic among broadcasters over the Federal Communications Commission's recent statement on cigarette advertising, but there is plenty of long-term concern. It isn't the statement itself that has them worried, it's the questions posed by the extension of the so-called "fairness doctrine" into the area of advertising.

TV already carries specials on smoking and messages from such groups as the American Cancer Society. The immediate requirement, presumably, can be met by expanding these. Up to now, however, the "fairness doctrine" has functioned purely in the field of radio and TV editorializing. In effect, the FCC now has tagged commercials as controversial broadcasts within the meaning of the "doctrine," and this raises some very involved questions.

A primary question, of course, is the possibility that this ruling may be further extended to other advertising—beer commercials, for example—which some viewer may consider controversial. For the present, at least, the FCC's intention apparently is to limit the ruling to cigarettes on the grounds that they have been rated a possible health hazard. But the precedent has been set.

Second, what if adequate airing of the other side? Unlike the "equal time" provision, the "fairness doctrine" does not require a minute-for-minute rebuttal—it lets the station decide what's "fair." When it comes to commercials, this may be difficult to assess.

Finally, there's some feeling that the commission may have staged an end-run around Congress, which had the option of laying down conditions for broadcast advertising for cigarettes and didn't exercise it.

All these points have to be weighed before the broadcasters deliver their comments, but they will deliver them and probably at a high level.

Thurgood Marshall—Cheating Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, whatever platitudes and praise that can be dug up to justify Thurgood Marshall's appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court, the truth remains that he is dishonest—and his deeds against the American people have never been repudiated or corrected.

There are, I am certain, many Negro lawyers—and every American Negro, all who can trace their lineage back, are of slave ancestry. There are many who worked their way through college and law school as have many whites.

But there are also Negro lawyers who are morally and professionally honest and dedicated to the American constitutional Government under which the United States will survive, or without which our country will perish. Marshall's appointment must, then, have been for some other consideration than that he was a deserving Negro.

The record of Thurgood Marshall as a scamp, a cheat, and user of false evidence in the Brown case was restated in the June 26, 1967, U.S. News & World Report at page 13. What a minute shade of difference between Marshall's demeanor in the Brown case from the crime of bribing judges, or the use of a bought witness with perjured testimony at a trial. Is not the witnesses' oath to "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth"?

He bought his verdict and now the American people are asked to reward a dishonest man by giving him a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court. Cheating dare not prosper—for if it prosper none dare call it cheating. His record and past deeds offer more basis for removal from office than for elevation to the bench.

Mr. Speaker, I include the U.S. News & World Report article following my comments:

AN INSIDE STORY OF THE MARSHALL ROLE IN THE SCHOOL-DESEGREGATION DECISION

Insight into the attitude of Thurgood Marshall toward the Constitution and the law is revealed in a speech that was made on Dec. 28, 1961, by a history professor.

This speech is getting attention of Senators. It was made by Alfred H. Kelly, professor of history at Wayne State University, Detroit, before the American Historical Association in Washington, D.C.

In July, 1953, Thurgood Marshall, as counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, had asked Mr. Kelly—among others—to prepare a research paper on the intent of framers of the Four-

teenth Amendment with respect to constitutionality of segregated schools.

FOR A "PLAUSIBLE" CASE

The paper, according to Mr. Kelly, was to be used by NAACP lawyers preparing a brief for argument before the Supreme Court. Aim of the brief, said Mr. Kelly, was to provide a "plausible" historical case for ruling that the Fourteenth Amendment was intended by its framers to forbid racial segregation.

Mr. Kelly joined the research group, which included 125 historians, political scientists, constitutional lawyers and educators. Their conference was held in September of 1953.

"Ten days later, early in October," Mr. Kelly told the Historical Association, "I was surprised to receive a phone call from Thurgood Marshall. . . . My help, he said with careful flattery, was needed very badly on the brief. My vanity thus touched to the quick, I came."

This time there was a group of 12. The result of their work was a paper based, Mr. Kelly said, "on the theory that it would not do to get too far involved in specific historical detail with respect to framer intent, and that the association's case might best be cast in very generalized terms with a deliberate avoidance of the particular."

Mr. Kelly continued in his address:

"This tactic, Marshall now informed us, might get past two or three of the Justices, but it would darn well never get past [Justices] Frankfurter or Douglas. 'I gotta argue these cases,' Thurgood said, 'and if I try this approach, those fellows will shoot me down in flames.'"

"I am very much afraid that for the next few days I ceased to function as a historian and, instead, took up the practice of law without a license. The problem we faced was not the historian's discovery of the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; the problem instead was the formulation of an adequate gloss on the fateful events of 1866 sufficient to convince the Court that we had something of a historical case. . . .

"It is not that we were engaged in formulating lies; there was nothing as crude and daft as that. But we were using facts, emphasizing facts, being down on facts, sliding off facts, quietly ignoring facts, and, above all, interpreting facts in a way to do what Marshall said we had to do—get by those boys down there."

"There was one optimistic element in all this, as Marshall pointed out: It was obvious that the Court was looking for a plausible historical answer. . . .

"In other words, Marshall said, we didn't need to win a historical argument hands down—all we needed was a face-saving draw. 'A nothing-to-nothing score,' Marshall put it, 'means we win the ball game.' I believe, by the way, that this was a correct interpretation of the Court's mood. . . .

"gradually, in the next three days, we hammered out a strategy. . . .

"The Fourteenth Amendment, we told ourselves, had been necessary to accomplish a vast sweep of purpose far beyond the Civil Rights Act. Here we came down hard on [Senator Jacob Merritt] Howard's announcement that the purpose of the Amendment had been to abolish all class and caste in the United States. And we pounced on a phrase Jay Graham [a constitutional historian] had dug up: Bingham [Representative John A. Bingham], in defending the Amendment in the House, had indeed said Congress now was writing a constitutional provision, not drafting a statute; that statutes are writ sharp and narrow and specific but constitutions are writ broad for ages yet unborn. . . .

"This is the argument, essentially, that you will find incorporated in the historical portions of the NAACP brief as it went to the Court. This is the argument Marshall used in oral argument in answer to questions from the Justices. . . .

June 26, 1967

Oregon to proceed with plans for additional campsites and other tourist facilities now delayed because of the uncertain future of this area; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area would stabilize conditions in the Florence-Reedsport-Coos Bay area by removing uncertainty as to the future ownership of lands in and near the dunes; now, therefore,
Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation placing under the United States Forest Service the area to be known as the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, located south of the Siuslaw River and north of Tenmile Creek. The Congress is memorialized further to insure the unqualified continuation of domestic and industrial water supplies within such area.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be sent to the presiding officer of each chamber of the Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Secretary of the Interior and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

Everybody's Pal?—It Doesn't Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in matters of foreign policy, we as Americans have been advised that we must "think the unthinkable" as a means of breaking new ground in the solution of great and grave problems.

Perhaps one of the assumptions we should challenge is the assumption that we must be everybody's pal—that U.S. foreign policy must be geared to popularity on a comprehensive worldwide basis.

This has special significance at this time in the wake of the Johnson-Kosygin meeting and the maneuverings relating to the Middle East. And at this point in my remarks I want to call attention to a newspaper column by Jenkin Lloyd Jones of June 24, 1967:

It's TIME To Be STIFFLY CORRECT

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The time may have arrived when the American people should quit trying to be so puppy-dog friendly to the world and assume a more dignified posture of "correctness."

Americans are, perhaps, the friendliest people on earth. Part of it comes from our bigness and isolation. At home we see few foreigners. An alien accent intrigues us. In any erudite cocktail party the crowd is generally thickest around the foreign visitor.

We have, for a long time, suffered from a missionary guilt complex. It's an interesting combination of smugness and concern. We are proud of the "American way." We feel sure that our outlooks and techniques are superior to those of most other countries. We would like to share our wisdom. Hence, the missionary. On the other hand, we are easily guilt-ridden because of our relative opulence. So we give, often lavishly.

Our British cousins in their great days were somewhat like us, but not much. They were eloquently and sometimes arrogantly proud of the empire. They wept a little for

the heathen. They had their heroic missionaries and teachers who went forth into the pools of ignorance and fever to discourage infanticide, stop cannibalism and outlaw suttee. But hard on their heels came the flag and the traders.

As the Basuto chief bitterly told one of my old anthropology professors, "When the white man came here he had the Bible and we had the land. Now we've got the Bible and he's got the land."

Among the more recent colonial powers you might classify, in descending order of humanity, the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Germans and the Japanese. The Russians were never well enough organized in the 18th and 19th centuries to seize distant lands from primitive peoples. But in their conquest and treatment of the European satellites they would go to the bottom of the list.

Only the Americans were haunted by their strength and nervous about their prosperity. Only the Americans set forth wistfully to make the world love them.

Funny thing. The Israelis bombed a U.N. force in the Gaza Strip and nine Indian and two Brazilian soldiers were killed. The diplomats in the U.N. Security Council all tried to top each other in expressions of regret and grief. But 54,000 Americans died in what was billed as an official U.N. action in Korea. How much weeping did the United Nations do for our boys?

There is the human inclination to make the friend of your enemy your enemy. All our largesse to India was forgotten the moment we gave arms to Pakistan. And the Pakistanis damned us for our aid to India.

For many years Americans tried to make themselves loved in the Near East. The American University in Beirut has educated generations of Arab leaders. We were lavish with Fulbright scholarships. We poured tremendous aid funds into Arab nations, including those whose oil-rich sheiks bought Cadillacs by the shipload and rented whole hotels in Switzerland.

But because America has promoted Israel we were hated. And when Gamal Abdel Nasser, in the bleak early hours of June 6, tried to alibi the collapse of his air force by claiming that American and British planes had shot it down, the whole Near East bought it immediately. Mobs converged on the American embassies. The American libraries went up in flames.

Maybe we ought to relax. Maybe we should quit trying to be loved. Maybe we should assume that we will be spit on. America is a complacent dragon, a fine beast on which to beat with wooden swords and have one's picture taken standing on its back. Hatred of it is a huge convenience for a government entangled in its own stupidity.

So be it. If we expect to be hated we will be freer to do intelligent things. We won't have to keep shoring up corrupt regimes in the hope that they will become reliable friends. We can spend our foreign aid more wisely. We can seal off some famous rat holes.

We can say, "Look, your excellency. Your mob burnt our free library, which happens to be the biggest and best in your country. If you want it back, jail the leaders and build us a building. We'll just replace the books."

Or, "See here, your highness. We figure you'll gut us the first time it's convenient, but in the meantime we'd like to help your people. If you've got a sound plan and a way to keep your gang from cracking the safe we may bankroll it."

This kind of talk will make more sense to more people than our past habit of turning the other cheek with a sickly grin. Everybody's pal—hell! It just didn't work. Let's be stiffly correct for a change, and maybe they'll conclude we're not so crazy after all.

New Chamber Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently Bob Waterman assumed the presidency of the Davenport Chamber of Commerce. He will provide forward and constructive leadership in a growing and rapidly developing community.

A writer for the Davenport Times-Democrat interviewed Mr. Waterman and wrote the following story about him: RIVER IS A TREMENDOUS ADVANTAGE—CHALLENGES AHEAD FOR CHAMBER CHIEF

(By Julie Jensen)

The first mountain Robert Van Patten Waterman ever climbed was the Matterhorn, and this response to challenge augurs well for the Davenport Chamber of Commerce, which has elevated the Davenport attorney to its presidency.

Waterman stands out in a crowd with an imposing height of six-foot-three. Brown-eyed with silver-touched dark hair and a robust complexion, he radiates elan.

He is a general partner in a law firm of nine partners and associates, including his two older brothers, Larned, and C. D. Waterman Jr. His father and grandfather were lawyers before him.

His executive duties for the Chamber will be demanding, and Waterman says, "I'll have to find more hours in the day. I don't want to reduce my time in the legal profession, so I suppose it means less leisure and more weekend work."

"I have been involved with the Chamber of Commerce for about eight years," he says. "The Chamber is committing itself to some form of urban re-development to make Davenport competitive with other cities. This takes money—either private or public funds—and there is a departure from earlier thinking that federal funds are tainted per se."

"The philosophy now is that federal funds for a useful purpose are acceptable, and there is nothing morally wrong with attempting to regain some of our tax dollars."

Rebuilding the city's sewer system, dealing with substandard housing problems, and providing an expressway from Interstate 80 to the heart of downtown are Davenport's priority concerns, Waterman believes.

"Cities of lesser size are making great strides in development," he says, "and we cannot lag behind. We do need help. There isn't enough private capital, and we're paying such high taxes that we should have some of that money back. If we make plans, we can maintain local control."

"We are in a fact-facing era, and the philosophy of the past is changing to the practical idealism of the present."

The downtown business area faces slow strangulation without a quick, convenient ingress to its core, Waterman holds.

"Enlightened self-interest calls for some kind of an expressway to the downtown area," he says.

Keeping up with the working of 21 Chamber committees may keep the new president off the golf course, but he says he really doesn't mind.

"I played my best game between the ages of 16 and 18," he says, "and I've never recovered my former glory!"

Waterman praises the recreational opportunities of the Mississippi and regrets that he

missile cruiser USS Boston heeled close alongside while the destroyer USS Blandy and the Coast Guard cutter Ingham rode easy on station in the white-capped waters nearby, escort vessels for the occasion.

We were aboard the guided missile cruiser USS Canberra east of Cape Henry, Virginia. Soon we were to be witness to history; the selection of an Unknown American fighting man who would represent all of the country's dead for World War II.

The Canberra and Boston were running abreast of each other now and highlines has been rigged between them in a great criss-cross pattern. Over the lines, from the Boston, were to be transferred two caskets, one containing the body of an Unknown American slain in the fighting in Europe, the other of an Unknown of the Pacific campaigns.

The caskets were brought over with speed and precision. No other highline transfers had ever been made with such dignity.

They were placed at the foot of two Terrier missiles on the after deck of the Canberra, along with another also highlined from the Boston, which contained an Unknown selected 10 days earlier to represent all of those Americans who died fighting in Korea.

It was May 2, 1958, and it was high noon. Soon, one of the two Unknowns of World War II would be selected as the Unknown to represent all the American dead of the war. The other would be buried at sea with full military honors.

From the Atlantic Fleet's Cruiser Force Navy Band came the somber strains of Chopin's Funeral March. The dirge pulsed solemnly over the ship, across the rag-draped caskets, then got caught up in the gusts of wind and rain and fell off in silence in the distance.

Rear Admiral Lewis S. Parks, commander of the Atlantic Fleet Cruiser Force, began the ceremonies, and noted:

"It is not necessary that we know their names. It is enough that they were our comrades and our shipmates. They were also our sons, our brothers, our fathers, our friends, and for all of us they gave 'that last full measure of devotion'."

A wreath of red and white carnations rested inboard of the caskets. It would serve as the badge of distinction to denote which of the two Unknowns would be selected for the singular honor being bestowed that day.

PICKED BY NAVY HERO

The choice was to be made by William R. Charette, a Navy hospital corpsman first class, who won the Medal of Honor for supreme heroism on the battlefields of Korea.

There was high drama in the air as Charette came forward and picked up the wreath with deliberate precision.

He walked slowly with it back around the three caskets, then stopped facing the one in the center, the one holding the body of the Unknown of Korea.

Which of the World War II Unknowns would be selected to represent them all?

For several moments Charette stood absolutely still, almost rigid, as though he'd been painted there by some great artist preserving a moment in time no one wanted repeated.

Charette was contemplative, tight-lipped. The rain that had pocketed the day in grey suddenly lifted and the seas around us quieted somewhat.

The moment had come. The choice was made.

"I DON'T KNOW WHY"

Charette turned, then gently, with reverence for the occasion, placed the wreath on the casket on the right. He had started to place it on the one on the left, but suddenly changed his mind. "I don't know why, I just turned to the right," he said later.

Now, for the first time since World War II ended 13 years earlier, Americans could honor one fallen son as representing all of them who died in that war.

And now, too, Americans were to honor three Unknowns—of World Wars I and II and Korea.

Following the selection ceremony, the caskets holding the bodies of the World War II and Korean War Unknowns were transferred by highline to the Blandy which would take them to Washington where they were to lie in state in the Capitol Rotunda until May 30.

Meanwhile, aboard the Canberra, the body of the Unknown not selected by Charette was still to be buried at sea.

THE BURIAL AT SEA

At 1:40 p.m. that afternoon, as the Canberra rode the seas 33 miles east of Cape Henry, the word was passed, "All hands bury the dead."

The body of the Unknown waited aft on the starboard side of the ship, flanked by an honor guard of six sailors. With them, representing all services, since no one knew which branch of the armed services this Unknown had served in, were Admiral Jerauld S. Wright, Lieutenant General Herbert B. Powell, Major General William L. Kennedy, Lieutenant General Edwin A. Pollock and Read Admiral Harold C. Moore, representing the Navy, Army, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard respectively.

Prayers were said and scriptures read. Chaplains of several faiths took part; Navy Lieutenant Boris Geeza, Eastern Orthodox; Air Force First Lieutenant Nathan M. Landman, Jewish; Army Major Henry L. Durand, Roman Catholic, and Navy Captain J. Floyd Dreith, Protestant. For as the identity and service of the man was unknown so was his religion.

Chaplain Dreith intoned: "... for as much as it has pleased Almighty God, in His wise providence, to take out of this world the soul of our departed unknown comrade and friend, we therefore commit his mortal remains to the deep."

The honor guard of six sailors lifted the pallet on which the body of the Unknown rested, wrapped in a canvas shroud and weighted down with 200 pounds of lead and sand. It slid away easily to meet its final resting place.

DRAMA AT ARLINGTON

Eight Marines of a firing squad fired three volleys in rapid succession in final salute. Then James W. Howard, musician seaman, played the nostalgic notes of Taps.

The committal ceremony was over.

This day's drama had ended, but it was only prologue to the drama to unfold four days later.

At 1 p.m. on Memorial Day 1958 the caskets containing the bodies of the Unknowns of World War II and the Korean War were taken from the Capitol Rotunda. There they had lain in state alternately on the catafalque that had held the body of Abraham Lincoln and an identical one made especially for this historic occasion.

The Unknowns were placed on caissons drawn by two teams of six grey horses each and taken to Arlington National Cemetery to be interred in twin crypts carved into the marble plaza in front of the Tomb of the Unknown of World War I.

The funeral cortege proceeded from the Capitol down Constitution Avenue, around the Lincoln Memorial and across the Arlington Memorial Bridge to the amphitheater at Arlington Cemetery.

Air Force F-101 jets flew overhead in salute in the "missing buddy" formation.

EISENHOWER GIVES MEDALS

The day's ceremonies, from the time the bodies were carried down from the Capitol Rotunda until they were buried, lasted some 200 minutes, and for every one of them cannon boomed in salute from a sloping hill overlooking the Potomac River.

Inside the marble columns of the amphitheater at Arlington, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Supreme Court Jus-

tices, congressmen, foreign dignitaries, and more than 200 winners of the Medal of Honor took part in special ceremonies before the final interment. The President placed Medals of Honor on black pillows near the casket heads of each of the Unknowns. The citations were brief.

That to the Unknown of World War II was bestowed for "... exemplifying the selflessness of all our fallen heroes of the Second World War who, in courageous defense of the ideals of democracy against aggression, gave their lives to preserve our noble heritage."

The other called the Unknown of Korea "... symbolic of the gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty of all members of the armed forces of the United States who gave their lives in the Korean conflict while defending the ideals of freedom and democracy."

As the Unknowns were taken from the amphitheater to the marble plaza, a salute of 21 guns was sounded, then three final volleys after they had been committed to their crypts. A bugler sounded Taps.

The drama that had begun hours earlier had ended.

Preservation of the Oregon Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the preservation and recreational development of a beautiful stretch of Pacific coastline called the Oregon Dunes has been a continuing concern of public-spirited citizens in southern Oregon for many years. While there has been some disagreement, occasionally heated, over the best method of attaining these goals, few dispute the desirability of reaching them.

The Oregon Legislature has gone on record in favor of establishing "an Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area under the administration of the U.S. Forest Service." Since I support this concept and have been developing legislation to bring it about, I am pleased to introduce Enrolled House Joint Memorial 7 of the 54th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

(Sponsored by Representatives Elder, Bedingfield, Gwinn, Hanneman, Kennedy, Leiken, McKenzie, Martin, Richards, Skelton, Wilson, Senators Husband, Stadler.)

Whereas establishment of an Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area under the administration of the United States Forest Service would end a controversy over the proper treatment of this area that has continued for nearly a decade; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area would avoid condemnation of private property and the absorption of tax-paying lands by the Federal Government, which would deprive local government and schools of part of their support; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area would permit continuation of revenues received by the United States Forest Service from the sale of timber therein, which would be discontinued if such area were under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service; and

Whereas establishment of such recreation area at an early date would permit the United States Forest Service and the State of

June 26, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3249

Is the United Nations Still Useful?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, due to recent actions taken by Secretary General U Thant in the Middle East crisis, the usefulness of the Secretary General and of the United Nations itself, has come in to question.

Two columns recently appearing in the Washington Star, dealt with, first, U Thant's illegal assumption of authority to unilaterally remove the Emergency Force from the Middle East, and second, the future of the United Nations as an effective peacekeeping organization.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following columns written by David Lawrence and Ralph McGill, which appeared in the June 21, 1967, edition of the Washington Star.

The articles follow:

THANT'S USEFULNESS QUESTIONED

The usefulness of U Thant as secretary-general of the United Nations has come into question. Without placing the matter before the U.N. General Assembly, he granted promptly last month President Nasser's request that the U.N. peace-keeping force be withdrawn from the armistice line on the Israel border. This led to the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East.

Two pertinent documents now have been made public. One plainly sets forth the views of the late Dag Hammarskjold, who, as secretary-general in 1956, arranged with President Nasser for the U.N. force to go on duty at the armistice line and stay there "until the task of the force was completed." The other is the reply just made by Thant to the Hammarskjold memorandum.

It is clear that Hammarskjold knew there was a delicate point involved, and he left for future guidance a carefully written record and analysis of the whole subject. Thant now brushes this aside as an interpretation not binding upon him.

But there is a difference between an argument over the right of Egypt to ask for the withdrawal of the U.N.'s peace-keeping force and the obligation of the secretary-general to submit the whole matter to the General Assembly for its consideration and decision.

The real issue is what Secretary-General Thant should have done about Egypt's request. He consulted on May 17 with the members of the advisory committee of the United Nations Emergency Force—representatives of India, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Brazil, Yugoslavia and Canada. Some of these envoys warned him that he should take the matter up with the General Assembly.

Unfortunately, however, the secretary-general had already advised Egypt that, if it formally requested withdrawal of the peace-keeping force, this would be granted. It was really not too late even then for a special meeting of the General Assembly to be called to deal with the problem, but Thant took no such steps and said that "it is not within the competence of the General Assembly to act." He felt that he himself had no choice but to grant the request from Nasser for the withdrawal. This he did on May 18.

The Hammarskjold memorandum of August 1957, on the other hand, argued these same points and emphasized that Egypt had made a "good faith" agreement not to with-

draw its "consent" to the presence of the peace-keeping force without submitting the matter to the General Assembly. The late secretary-general wrote:

"My starting point in the consideration of this last-mentioned problem—the limitation of Egypt's sovereign right in the interest of political balance and stability in the United Nations Emergency Force operation—was the fact that Egypt had spontaneously endorsed the General Assembly resolution of Nov. 5, 1956 (creating the force) and by endorsing that resolution had consented to the presence of the United Nations Emergency Force for certain tasks. They could thus not ask the UNEF to withdraw before the completion of the tasks without running up against their own acceptance of the resolution on the force and its tasks."

Hammarskjold also mentions that he put squarely to President Nasser the necessity for an "agreement on withdrawal" with respect to the peace-keeping force, and told him that, "unless an agreement of this type was made," the secretary-general would recommend to the General Assembly the immediate withdrawal of troops which had just been sent in to police the armistice. Egypt's president was so anxious to have the peace-keeping force established that he acquiesced in the agreement.

The present secretary-general now says that, while he was aware of the Hammarskjold memorandum, it was not an "official document." But the points made cannot be erased. For the duty of the secretary-general is not to resolve such an important issue himself but to leave this to the United Nations, of which he is merely an administrative official.

The making of vital decisions is the function of the Security Council or of the General Assembly as set forth in the Charter itself. As it turned out, the one-man ruling gave encouragement to Egypt, which promptly mobilized its forces on the borders of Israel, and war ensued. Certainly the United Nations should provide against a recurrence of such blunders.

FUTURE OF UNITED NATIONS SEEN IN PERIL

What is the future of the United Nations?

Is the Middle Eastern crisis the beginning of a renaissance? Or is the U.N. sun setting?

The Soviet Union has been making much use of the U.N. Security Council. It was a somewhat abrasive and critical Nikolai Fedorenko who demanded a hurried, immediate "emergency" session of the council on that fateful Wednesday, June 7, when the Israeli successes in the Sinai desert and against Jordan were confirmed.

Yet, this was the same Fedorenko who on Monday before that Wednesday brusquely had refused the U.S. recommendation that a cease-fire be sought.

Again, on Thursday, June 8, the Security Council was summoned back. Once more the pleasant-looking, bow-tie wearing, pipe-smoking Fedorenko used the session to condemn the United States, and to demand the Israelis return all they had gained in war.

It was possible, sitting there in the press section of the council chamber to feel the almost tangible irony, the cynical brazenness of the situation.

It is chiefly the Russians, though not entirely so, who have not paid their financial allotments due the United Nations. It is largely their financial neglect, followed by others in their block, that has kept the United Nations close to the abyss of bankruptcy and substantially reduced the organization's prestige and potential for action. That the Russians should have so vigorously sought to use the United Nations—only when, and after the Arab allies had made their war thrust and been defeated—serve merely to etch deeper the irony of that neglect.

With the U.N. prestige and potential thus minimized, the international arena was, of necessity, reduced to power operations.

The Middle East buildup was open. There was no secret about it. Nasser mobilized his troops. Nasser demanded that United Nations security troops be withdrawn from the Gaza strip. The alacrity with which Secretary General U Thant complied has damaged him and the United Nations. The Israelis are uncomfortably right in charging that U.N. actions had encouraged the Arabs to war.

There was undenied escalation of raids into Israel by Shukeiry's "Palestine Legion" and by the Al Assifa (the Storm) guerillas of Syria. It is members of these groups who have maintained sniping since the acceptance of the cease-fire.

The Soviet Union holds the solution to the future of the Middle East. The Russians can proceed to rearm the Arabs with tanks, MIG aircraft and weapons. They can, in and out of the United Nations, promote discord rather than a settlement the Arabs can reluctantly accept. The Israelis will not want to keep the Sinai. They have a right to hold the high ground along the borders of Syria from which came the mortar and shell fire against valley and villages—and, of course, against the guerilla raids of Al Assifa. The Gulf of Aqaba must be open to all shipping. The United Nations—and the Russians—were silent when Egypt blockaded Aqaba as a part of the pre-war preparations by Nasser.

Jerusalem might be internationalized—if the United Nations is made viable by Soviet support and cooperation.

Soviet "interest" in Africa remains higher than commitment to the United Nations. Nasser had Soviet aid in Aden, at the entrance to the Red Sea. The Somalis had Soviet help across from Aden at the Red Sea entrance. Algeria is the latest "interest" in Africa—and the Middle East.

The outlook is complex and, at best, hidden by intrigues, feuds, angers and ambitions. The United Nations could be entering a new phase of usefulness. Or, it could be undergoing cynical "use" for non-peaceful objectives. If so, the United Nations, God forbid, may be on its way out.

Reason and Restraint in a Democratic Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in a commencement address last month to the graduating class of the State University of New York at Buffalo, President Kingman Brewster, Jr., of Yale University, discussed dissent in a democratic society. The newspaper coverage intrigued me and, now that I have read the speech in its entirety, I find my curiosity well rewarded.

Seldom have I seen a more succinct analysis of the politics of polarization and accommodation; or a more eloquent plea for the restraint and tolerance which permit a democratic society to enjoy freedom and grow through diversity.

President Brewster advocated no easy solution to our involvement in Vietnam, which is the subject of much of today's agonizing debate. But he emphasized that the terms of that debate are of crit-

A 3250

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 26, 1967

ical importance to the institutions of free government and to the integrity of our academic traditions.

I believe that this warning against the antirational tendencies of suppression and disruption merits a wide audience, and under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, AT BUFFALO, BY KINGMAN BREWSTER, JR., PRESIDENT, YALE UNIVERSITY, MAY 28, 1967

Screaming journalism makes it fashionable these days to engage in the game of gap spotting. Whether in ladies swimming garb or White House communiques—its the gap that counts. Then there is the "generation gap." Such is the perversity of social history that the well rounded boy of a generation ago is the square of today. Then there is the ancient gap between the academy and the market place measured by the holler than thou scorn of the academics; more than reciprocated by the "you can't change human nature" realism of the businessman.

Whatever the differences of political taste among us, however, our common ground is more important. I would like to dwell here for a moment on the importance of holding that common ground against the invasion of suppression from the right and disruption from the left.

On the far left there are some few so disillusioned with things as they are that they would tear the house of freedom down by pulling the props of all self restraint. On the far right are some few so panicked by the prospect of any change that they would suppress all social criticism and all striving for broader freedom. Both would pit hate against hate so that all of us, liberal and conservative alike would be consumed in a violent civil war of extremes.

The liberals among us, especially the academic liberals, are sometimes tempted to rationalize and excuse a call to hate or violence if it is uttered in the name of the victims of poverty or discrimination. Conscience stricken quiet acquiescence in slogans of hate and destruction; rationalization that "you can't blame them," or a cynical defense that "it's the only way to call attention to the problem" each loosens one more stone to start the avalanche of counter hate, counter violence, whose burden will fall hardest on any minority which can be made the scapegoat. Its cruelest victims are always the minorities in whose name violence unleashes counter violence.

We of academic privilege who are supposed to be our brothers' thinker and dedicated to rational persuasion must repudiate this deliberate mongering of racial hate and willful incitement to violence.

The conservatives among us, especially the business conservatives, are sometimes tempted to rationalize and excuse the witch hunt and the suppression of civil rights. They march toward oppression under the banner of maintaining civil order. Repudiation of violent change spills over into rejection of all change. Distaste for the implications of hateful slogans like "black power" recoils into the subtler, more polite forms of "white power" and almost unconsciously permits racism to become respectable again.

Those of commercial, financial and industrial privilege who are supposed to symbolize the world's greatest accomplishment of material welfare and economic opportunity must repudiate this deliberate scapegoat politics and the appeal to "white power."

If we are not to be forced into a choice between radicals and reactionaries, then liberals and conservatives must defend their common faith in progress through ordered freedom. Neither molotov cocktails nor police barricades can make dignity and decency and opportunity a living reality for every-

one's children. The urgent task of those gathered here, young and old alike, is to demonstrate that the promise of the freedom we take for granted can made real for the whole society.

And now, to the age old strain which gross economic, educational, and social inequality have always put upon the processes of ordered freedom, is added the strain of a war we wish we were not in, which we cannot totally win, and which we dare not lose.

Five years ago this month, President Kennedy resolved to multiply vastly the armed American presence in Vietnam. It was then plausible to say that there was no other way to prevent the balance of communist world power from shifting from the Soviet counsel of coexistence to the Chinese prophets of aggression.

The American commitment in Vietnam proved irreversible; and, being irreversible, could only vindicate the forebodings of those who predicted vast expansion of the initial commitment when it was made. But this hindsight does not alter the plausibility and possible correctness of that decision.

To allow a war of national liberation to succeed in 1962 might have vindicated Chinese aggressive doctrine, and encouraged a worldwide rash of sponsored wars; civil in form, but imperial in global pattern.

There were differences then, plausibly, rationally debated. Disagreement, however, did not then fester into distrust; opposition did not erupt into demonstration, let alone disruption.

Now, five years later, our military commitment has reached almost the exact level gloomily predicted by those who counselled President Kennedy against the initial move. While the military situation is less desperate in terms of possible United States defeat in South Vietnam, it is apparently no better in terms of bringing a peace which might outlast our presence. It is vastly worse in terms of the risk of larger war.

Even though history will probably never put the matter so clearly each one of us should perhaps answer the question: if the Chinese were to give us an ultimatum to withdraw or to face their hordes as in Korea, do we stand or should we retreat. On this question the division in this country would not be evenly divided but there would be a deep gulf between fellow citizens.

Several in number, but a minority, I think a very small minority, would say that to resist, not to withdraw, would condemn the world to nuclear destruction.

Many many more, an overwhelming majority I believe, would say that to fall back in face of such threatened Chinese intervention would surely condemn the world to nuclear disaster.

The alternative lines of reasoning are each quite plausible.

One would say that to confront the Chinese, especially now that they have nuclear power, would be inevitably to invite us to use whatever force, including the weapons of frightfulness, would be necessary in order to prevail. The dikes of our self restraint would be breached beyond repair.

The counselors for withdrawal would say no stakes in Vietnam would begin to be worth this price.

The bigger voice, the more popular voice, would say: to back down in the face of Chinese ultimatum would forever vitiate our capacity to deter aggression or to prevent attack on our more vital interests. Nuclear war would ultimately be invited. In some future West Berlin or South Korea a confident enemy who thought he could call our bluff would find, too late, that he was in fact pushing us beyond our exasperation point.

To stand firm now when we might at best deter or at worst prevail without resort to nuclear weapons would be the only way to prevent a later global holocaust.

When differences are plausible and the stake for which disagreement wagers is the

survival of civilization itself, the confrontation generates a passion whose height or depth knows no limit. Let one spark of distrust fall from the torches of those who are not of good will and disagreement may flare into a conflict between those who would suppress and those who would disrupt the processes of democracy.

You know and I know that there are among us a few who would positively welcome a preventive war against China. Happily their voices are so few and their prescription so noxious that they will rarely avow their views in public.

You and I also know that there are some few, a very noisy few, who would like to see not only the Chinese prevail in Asia and world revolution spread, but who would welcome the destruction of the American society.

You and I also know friends of the right who are panicked by the threat of disorderly dissent, who assume that all objection to official policy is communist inspired. General Trudeau's testimony a few days ago reeks with this fearful invitation to suppression. And there are those, like Congressmen Rivers and Hebert, who are bold enough to imply that the first amendment to the Constitution, the first of the Bill of Rights, is an obstacle to the order they would seek.

You and I also know friends of the left whose impatience with the processes of democratic society urges recourse not only to protest and demonstration but to the threshold of violence and sabotage in the name of their own convictions.

Statements by some who seek to rally a following for a summer of protest against the Vietnam war have revealed a yearning for violent disruption, in callous disregard for the claims of ordered freedom and the democratic process.

It makes me unhappy that I have no confident prescription for a peace which would not invite an even more frightful war.

But I am confident that our chances of discovering such a path, and our chances of enduring and surviving this time of anguish depend upon convincing rejection of the counsels of suppression and disruption.

Freedom requires both boldness and patience.

To those who would suppress dissent I say you are of little faith, unworthy of those who have risked the unknown shores and the unknown frontier because they believed that no idea or way of life was good enough to be imposed.

Of course freedom is risky. The majority might be wrong. But freedom also requires patience. Somehow in the fullness of time people seem to be able to come out right, if censorship does not defraud them of a chance to make up their own mind.

To those who would disrupt the orderly processes of government in order to call attention to their convictions, I say you forfeit the consideration of a society which relies on rational persuasion as the arbiter of its destiny.

Of course the processes of a free society are often tedious and sometimes corrupt. But the ways of democracy are preferable to the dictate of even the most righteous; whether that dictate be imposed by the coercion of authority or the blackmail of disruption.

The dread is that these two monsters, suppression and disruption will feed and fatten each other. Each is, in fact, justified by the other.

If suppression is the mandate of official power, then indeed disruption may be the only recourse of those who believe in freedom.

If disruption is the counsel of those who disagree with official policy, then suppression may be the only recourse of those who believe in order.

What has this to do with you.

A very great deal. For you here have been privileged to struggle for knowledge and judgment and purpose in a place which has

June 26, 1967

A 3260

lived at 319 Audrey avenue in Brooklyn was killed about 3 P.M. last Saturday by small-arms fire while guarding an outpost somewhere in Vietnam, his father, Curtis C. Harman, said last night.

ENLISTED IN ARMY

His son had enlisted in the Army in June 1966, after finishing his second year at Loyola College, Mr. Harman said.

Although he was in the ROTC, he "couldn't wait and enlist. He volunteered for Vietnam . . . said he wanted to get in it before it was all over."

Mr. Harman said his son "read constantly, all about the military," had majored in political and military science while at Loyola and "wanted to make the military a career."

In addition to his parents, Private Harman is survived by a sister, Mr. Joyce Filipiak, of Munich.

must be respected: the President said that "if a single act of folly was more responsible for this explosion than any other," it was the Egyptian announcement of the closing of the Strait of Tiran. The need, he said, is for recognized boundaries and other arrangements that will guarantee all countries security against terror, destruction and war.

On those propositions Mr. Johnson may have seemed to be accepting the Israeli point of view. On the other main points he warned against letting military success blind a victor to the legitimate rights and interests of others; and he charged the nations of the region, not excluding Israel, with joint responsibility for at last doing something about the Arab refugees, of whom there are now more.

If the weight of the President's statement still falls on the Israeli side of the scales, why, that is where it falls.

Mr. Eban in the General Assembly gave Israel's case in full, and eloquently. Speaking after Premier Kosygin, he laid upon the Soviet Union a heavy responsibility for the war its proteges lost, and rejected as totally unacceptable to Israel a return to the situation of June 5, as called for by Russia and the Arabs. To return, he said, would be to try to "reconstruct a broken egg." Beyond that, he suggested concessions to the Arabs, with Jordanian access to the Mediterranean as an example, but made it plain that peace in the region Arabs and Israelis are "destined to share" would depend on face-to-face negotiations which alone, he said, could effectively remove the Middle East from the scope of global rivalries.

In the sense that Mr. Eban failed to propose that Israel roll over and die, it was a hard-line speech, but it did hold out some hope for a better era ahead.

And Mr. Kosygin? Did he recognize, in any slightest phrase, that the Arab cause was anything but impeccably pure? Did he to any degree at all join President Johnson in wishing to enlarge the arena of Russo-American common action? He did not. Mr. Kosygin's appearance, his first in this country, had been anticipated as an opportunity for Soviet statesmanship, no matter what the Soviet spokesman in the Security Council may have said in the immediate wake of the Israeli triumph. Instead, his address was a sterile echo of that spokesman's false charges and intemperate vilifications.

Mr. Eban, speaking of the Arabs, expressed a willingness to perceive "any glimmer of reality and moderation in the Arab mind." At another level of power, the United States would welcome a similar sign from the Russians. Yesterday, at least, no such sign was forthcoming.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald,
June 20, 1967]

A POSITIVE MIDEAST PROGRAM

President Johnson and Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban, in agreement on several points, have offered constructive approaches to peace in the Middle East. What Soviet Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin has offered is no approach at all, but a retreat from peace.

Besides inflaming the question of who was the aggressor, Kosygin's demand that Israel withdraw from Arab territory immediately and pay full war damages to the Arab nations would merely set the stage for renewed conflict. Kosygin is asking nothing less than a return to the status quo—back to the old boundaries, back to the old tensions, back to a situation in which the Arabs can rear. In short, back to the conditions that led to war in the first place. Kosygin's demands are inconsistent with his warning that conflict in the Mideast could lead to nuclear war.

By contrast, President Johnson, in his five principles for peace, recognizes that a key need is limiting the "destructive arms race." Eban recognizes it, too, and further realizes

that the arms race is a "fearful waste of economic energy" in the Mideast. Rather than encouraging a situation in which the arms race might be stimulated, the major powers should foster peaceful programs of economic and social development that would help Arabs and Israelis alike.

Mr. Johnson also echoed what Israel had said earlier—that the Arabs and the Israelis bear the main responsibility for establishing a long-range peace for their peoples. This is the only realistic appraisal. The United Nations failed before to preserve peace in the Mideast. The U.N. and the major powers should, of course, do what they can to re-establish peace, but their role in a settlement can be only supportive.

It is perhaps a small base from which to build a useful dialogue, but Mr. Johnson and Kosygin did agree on one point: that Israel has the right to a national life. Kosygin's U.N. speech was not constructive, and his walkout during Eban's reply cannot be ignored or excused. Yet the speech was delivered in a restrained manner, without any shoe-banging or other pyrotechnic effects. Some think Kosygin's comparative restraint left the door open for a meeting with President Johnson. Perhaps it did. And possibly talks between the two men could be of value at this time.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

The American People Support the President's Middle East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report that the Nation's press is paying a deserved tribute to President Johnson's handling of the Middle East crisis. There is almost unanimous agreement that our President has followed a responsible, prudent, and reasonable course in the Middle East—a course that certainly contrasts sharply with that of the Soviet Union.

I believe this editorial opinion reflects the overwhelming support the President's policy enjoys with the American people. As the Baltimore Sun noted in an editorial:

President Johnson's statement of the American position was one that can be subscribed to by anyone who genuinely wants a peaceful Middle East.

It is clear that President Johnson can look to the future with the knowledge that the American people stand solidly with him on our Government's policy in the dangerous and turbulent Middle East area. This fact will give the President enormous strength and confidence.

I insert into the RECORD two editorials that represent the kind of positive reaction that the President has received on his enunciation of American policy in the Middle East:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
June 20, 1967]

THREE SPEECHES

The state of the world was pretty well set forth yesterday in three speeches, one in Washington, by President Johnson, and two in New York, where Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union and Abba Eban, Foreign Minister of Israel addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations. The state of the world is not hopeless, but it is not good. Specifically as to the Middle East:

President Johnson's statement of the American position was one that can be subscribed to by anyone who genuinely wants a peaceful Middle East. The points are quite clear. As the "first and greatest principle," every nation in the area has a fundamental right to live. International maritime rights

Chicago are pleased with the appointment of this most qualified and dedicated Chicago police official. I take a special pride in that James Conlisk resides in the 11th District of Illinois and therefore is one of my constituents.

James Conlisk has been named to a formidable job but he brings to it formidable credentials. Deputy Superintendent Conlisk, shortly to be Superintendent Conlisk, said:

I pledge a continuation of the leadership that has brought Chicago to the forefront as one of the eminent police departments of the world.

All of Chicago wishes the new superintendent well.

U.S. News Report on Bond Dialog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the June 12, issue of U.S. News & World Report summarizes the present status of the bond battle. The magazine article's preface summary suggests:

Steam is building up behind a plan to prevent States and localities from selling tax-exempt bonds to build factories for private companies.

On a more pessimistic note the article indicates "industrial-aid bonds, though, may have too many friends to be stopped now."

I sincerely hope this second comment is not the case. The rapidly proliferating use of public industrial revenue bonds is perverting the market, causing serious dislocation, encouraging pirating of industry from one area to another, and seriously disadvantaging certain areas of the country who are unable, because of State law, to compete.

Those supporting reform in this abused area are asking for a hearing on the merits of the issues involved. Such a hearing would clearly demonstrate the need to alter present practices.

I commend the U.S. News & World Report article to the many Members of Congress who have been involved in the various phases of the debate over abuses in using public industrial revenue bonds:

A TAX INCENTIVE THAT'S COMING UNDER FIRE

Steam is building up behind a plan to prevent States and localities from selling tax-exempt bonds to build factories for private companies.

Even some States that use the practice want it banned.

The Johnson Administration, too, wants early action.

Industrial-aid bonds, though, may have too many friends to be stopped now.

A long feud between the Federal Government and State and local governments appears to be coming to a head now.

The issue is a rush by communities to sell their tax-exempt bonds to finance construction of industrial plants for leasing to private corporations.

Officials in Washington regard that growing practice as an "abuse" of the tax-exemption privilege that permits States and localities to finance public projects at lower

rates of interest than they otherwise would pay.

Support now appears to be building up rapidly for Administration efforts to stamp out such activities by denying tax exemption for future issues of municipal industrial-aid bonds. Some evidence of that growing support:

On May 31, the Investment Bankers Association issued a new policy statement saying that "the situation is rapidly deteriorating" and that "abuses of tax exemption have expanded to alarming proportions."

For the first time, the IBA adopted a resolution backing the Treasury plan to prevent this kind of bond.

On May 24, nine U.S. Senators and 16 Representatives joined to demand an end to industrial-aid bonds, which, they said, are being used by many States to pirate industries from other States.

On May 23, North Carolina's legislature, acting, as it said, "reluctantly as a defensive measure and with reservations," adopted a bill to permit the use of such bonds by communities.

In doing that, the legislature also adopted a resolution denouncing the practice it was authorizing and calling on the President, Congress and its "sister States" to stop it.

Governors of a number of States, particularly Northern States, have recently demanded action from Congress. One such State, Pennsylvania, is going ahead to adopt its own law authorizing industrial bonds while it waits.

Spreading practice. The use of tax-free bonds to finance private plants has been spreading rapidly.

Already in 1967, three States—in addition to North Carolina—have authorized their issuance. The three are Texas, Colorado and Utah.

This brings to 35 the number of States seeking to attract industry with this lure. Several others have authorized use of industrial-aid bonds on a limited basis.

In addition, a number of other States are in the process of adopting bills to authorize them. Wyoming's new law will be ready for use after a court test.

The chart on this page shows the big rise in offerings of these bonds.

Not until 1959 was as much as 15 million dollars' worth issued in a year. Last year, a tally by the IBA has just disclosed, the volume of new industrial-aid bonds going to market exceeded half a billion dollars.

So far this year, the volume is running well ahead of last year's, and the IBA says it estimates "conservatively" that the 1967 total will be at least three quarters of a billion dollars.

The biggest users of tax-free industrial bonds in most recent years have been Southern and Border States, though the practice has become widespread since it was first used in Mississippi in 1936.

Last year, for example, nearly two thirds of the half-billion-dollar total was offered by communities in Kentucky, Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas and West Virginia. Sizeable offerings also came from Delaware and Iowa.

Pros and cons. Those States are not the only friends which industrial-aid bonds have now.

Many members of the IBA itself are among the investment banking firms that underwrite new issues of these bonds.

Proponents of tax-free industrial bonds say they offer low-income, labor-surplus areas an effective method of attracting new industry, particularly corporations that lack capital to build new plants or credit to finance them at reasonable cost.

Administration officials, however, contend that communities now are getting further and further from that idea. Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, in a recent speech, had this to say:

"Now, more and more, this device is being used by corporations which are financially

strong and quite capable of obtaining their funds through normal market channels.

"When they turn to the local issuing agency for these funds they—and the local agency—are getting into an arrangement which distorts the tax-exemption privilege and which, in the long run, simply forces the federal tax system to support their financing."

Cases in point. The IBA, on May 31, gave these examples of recent issues sold or scheduled:

82.5 million dollars in bonds by Middletown, Ohio, for Armco Steel Corporation.

20 millions in bonds by Nevada, Mo., for Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company.

30 millions in bonds by Warren County, Ky., for Firestone Tire & Rubber Company.

80 millions in bonds by Wickliffe, Ky.—population 917—for West Virginia Pulp & Paper Company.

60 millions in bonds by Ford Madison, Ia., for a subsidiary of Sinclair Oil Corporation.

Other large companies for which substantial issues of tax-free bonds have been sold recently included American Can Company, Skelly Oil Company, Phoenix Steel Corporation, Rockwell-Standard Corporation and Air Reduction Company.

Objections to these bonds are offered by members of Congress who are pressing bills to apply income taxes to such issues in the future. In a May 24 statement they listed these arguments:

"Municipal industrial-development bond issues use public credit for essentially private purposes. . . .

"These bonds encourage the pirating of industrial plants . . . causing economic dislocation in the area abandoned. . . .

"These bonds hurt legitimate municipal borrowing. . . .

"These bonds cause unfair competition."

Matter of self-interest? The IBA itself bases its opposition on what it regards as the self-interest of its members and of State and local governments.

Its fear: that resentment against industrial-aid bonds will rise to a point that will endanger tax exemption for all future issues of State and local bonds.

Is Congress likely to ban industrial-aid bonds? Officials decline to make any prediction.

However, there is this note: The most powerful friend these bonds have is Representative Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which would have the job of writing the legislation. Mr. Mills' State, Arkansas, is a user of these bonds and issued 131 million dollars' worth of them in the four years 1963-66.

Pvt. Curtis Harman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. Curtis J. Harman, a young soldier from Maryland, was recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of Private Harman and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CURTIS HARMAN, ON GUARD DUTY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

A 21-year-old Baltimorean, Pfc. Curtis J. Harman, has been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Private Harman, a graduate of Poly who